



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## ADDRESS OF SAMUEL GOMPERS.

Spoken at the Cooper Union Meeting, held in favor of the ratification of the arbitration treaty, New York City, March 11th.

The question for which we have met this evening—the question that we are here to discuss—is, as has been rightly stated, a question of arbitration; the introduction of a new principle in government affairs between nations. During the earlier history of man, when the tribal struggles were rampant and man became the warrior and the conquered the slave, the slave of the conqueror, the determination of the future of tribes and nations depended absolutely upon the physical strength, the power of any tribe. This, in a larger sphere, to a greater degree, is still the dominant principle of government to-day. [A voice: “That is right.”] We see in this whole world of ours the people divided in separate countries with imaginary geographical lines dividing them and each bearing the other a mortal hatred; each of them having instilled into their minds not only a love of their own country, but a hatred of other countries. I imagine that in the establishment of the Republic of these United States our forefathers not only had in view the establishment of an independent nation, but at the same time to give to the world a new meaning of the rights of man. [Applause.] And in the Declaration of Independence, being the new magna charta of the human race, it declared that all men were born free and equal, and in that declaration it did not confine itself to the people of these colonies; but it was a declaration as broad as the universe. [Applause.] This new principle of the inalienable equality of man meant the sowing of seed, which has gone on planting itself in the hearts and the minds of the human family. And the people of France, soon taking courage from the declaration of our Colonial Congress, at one fell sweep determined to establish for themselves a Government by and for and of the people. [Applause.] After this declaration the seed was sown for wider comprehension of human rights and the futherance of human sympathies. It meant, too, that the day of militarism should be put an end to. [Applause.] That the day of government by force ought to stop; that the government of reason, the government of intelligence and the government of human interests should be paramount over the prowess of any men or set of men. [Applause.]

At best the profession of militarism is the profession of slaughter. At best it is barbaric. At best it is destructive, and there are few questions in the history of the world that have been settled right by the arbitrament of force. [Applause.] And certainly even among those questions which may have been settled right, few have been settled satisfactorily or humanely. In Continental Europe we see to-day, and have seen for more than one-third of a century, the people burdened by standing armies never before equalled in numbers and equipment as they are to-day, where people are by force of circumstances compelled to flee from the rigors of their own Government into ours to escape military service and to make the struggles of the toilers of our country more desperate and more acute. [Applause.] These countries, with their continued increase in their standing armies and their naval resources, seem to impel and give encouragement to many in our country who too often care to ape the manners of those on the other side, and who want to play with military and naval forces. [Ap-

plause.] We have seen, as we see now, numbers of men advocating a great increase in the army of our country. Ah, my friends, that in itself is a declaration that government by and for and of the people is not the success that we would have it. [Applause.] My friends, let me say this, that before this proposition for the great armament of our people, before the creation of great standing armies and increasing the military forces of our country, we should look well and should endeavor to find a way by which we can still maintain the simplicity of the form of our Government, while at the same time defending and maintaining the honor, the integrity and interests of our country. [Applause.] Here, right in our own city, we see this militant spirit being cultivated and developed. We see children of the people of our city in large numbers having the doors of our schoolrooms closed to them without the opportunity of an education to be given them. [Applause.]

We see at the same time the drill masters employed in the night schools that the boys who attend school by day may be drilled in military tactics at night. [Applause.] Let me say, my friends, that with this jingo spirit the people of our country have no interest and no sympathy. [Applause.] We are proud of the country which we claim as our own; we are proud of its history, proud of its heroes and proud of its traditions, and we hope as we struggle for its glorious future. But we maintain that patriotism does not mean the hatred of our neighbor. [Applause.] Nor do we believe that it is a wise policy, as some would advocate, that a foreign war might be a good cure for our domestic evils. The burdens of war have always fallen upon the masses of labor. [Applause.] I want to discuss this question not only from the standpoint of a citizen and a man, but I also want to express my judgment from a standpoint of the men who labor. [Applause.] And when I say labor I mean those who labor in the factories, in the stores, in the mills and in the mines. I mean the men who are known as the great body of wage-earners of our country. Upon them, as upon the workers of all classes, has always fallen the burden of war, to furnish the sinews of war while war lasts, to bear the burdens of increased taxation when war has ended, and to be shot to death upon the battle-field while war is in progress. [Applause.] Labor has had to make these sacrifices for the stupidity, for the inhumanity and for the viciousness of monarchs and false statesmen. [Applause.] While our honored Chairman was addressing the meeting I heard some gentleman in the audience say: “Yes; but England is starving her people in India.” I want to say to you, my friends, that so long as the people of India will not manifest to England or to the world that they have rights that are bound to be respected the people of India will be starved the same as the people of all countries will be.

You find in all countries and under all conditions that a great Power does not, will not, apparently it seems to be against its interests to arbitrate matters. If this proposition were for a treaty for arbitration between a great Power such as Great Britain or any other great Power of Europe and with some small principality, I should be opposed to such an arbitration treaty; for I know that in the nature of things those who have great power never yet fairly arbitrated with those who are weak. [Applause.] Let me say, my friends, that as between two countries, such as the United States and

Great Britain, each a master in its own domain, with the wonderful resources of each country, I believe that there can be no danger to the interests of our people, in submitting to arbitration within the limits as prescribed in the Treaty now pending before the United States Senate. [Applause.]

I want to say a word if there are wage-earners here and I believe there are a large number. I want to say a word particularly to them. You bear in mind, fellow-workers, that during the eras of war government is accorded greater powers than during eras of peace, and the apparent power exercised to maintain order is used oppressively and to suppress and to repress and often prevent the right of public meeting and public speech and free speech. In the exercise of great powers often requisite under military control, the rights of free meeting, the right of free speech and free press are endangered. And when the smoke of battle is gone, these rights taken from the masses of the people are seldom freely given back to the people. We saw that during our Civil War great legislation,—how it ran rampant and wild and how often there were passed laws that stand upon the statute books to-day and are held up to us as a preventive, as a damper, upon any hope or aspiration legislatively. The attitude of Labor has always been in favor of arbitration. It has sought arbitration in the disputes it has had with employers, and if arbitration has not been more successful, it cannot certainly be laid at the door of Labor. [Applause.] We want to settle these questions of controversy that arise and can be settled by an appeal to reason and an appeal to our judgment, an appeal to our sense of honor, an appeal to our interests; they can and they should be settled around the table where discussion and judgment and truth and justice shall decide.

These peoples of our country and of Great Britain have a great mission to perform. The two great English-speaking nations of the world should endeavor to rival with each other in the great marts of the world to overcome the obstacles that are still facing the world and progress and civilization; and so far as they can they should declare with a voice and volume that come from such a united strength that the influence and the power of the United States and Great Britain shall be thrown upon the side of peace, prosperity and progress.

I have said that the organizations of labor have always stood for the unification of the human race, the recognition that, after all, we are brothers of one human family. We want to overcome the petty jealousies, the strife and discord, that have made countless myriads of widows and orphans, and sent thousands and thousands of men to untimely graves. We want to accomplish peace on earth and good will toward all men. We hope to help in the realization of the poet's dream when we would have a parliament of men and a federation of the world; and, in the language of the immortal bard, we can say:

"Then let us pray that come it may—  
As come it will for a' that—

That man to man, the world o'er,  
Shall brothers be for a' that!" — *The Independent*.

#### THE GENESIS OF JINGOISM.

FROM THE PROGRESSIVE REVIEW.

A century ago Europe was cosmopolitan, to-day she is national and particularist. The eve of the French Revolution

found every wise man in Europe—Lessing, Kant, Goethe, Rousseau, Lavater, Condorcet, Priestley, Gibbon, Franklin—more of a citizen of the world than of any particular country. Goethe confessed that he did not know what patriotism meant, and was glad to be without it. Mazzini, in his comparison of Goethe with Byron, makes this a formidable indictment against the Sage of Weimar. Cultured men of all countries were at home in polite society everywhere. Kant was immensely more interested in the events of Paris than in the life of Prussia. Italy and Germany were geographical expressions, those countries being filled with small states in which there was no political life, but in which there was much interest in the general progress of culture.

The Revolution itself was at bottom also human and cosmopolitan. It is, as Lamartine said, "a date in the human mind," and it is because of that fact, that all the carping of critics like Taine cannot prevent us from seeing that the character of the men who led the great movements of the Revolution can never obliterate the momentous nature of the titanic strife. The soldiers of the Revolution who, bare-footed and ragged, drove the insolent reactionaries from the soil of France, were fighting not merely for some national cause, but for a cause dimly perceived to be the cause of general mankind. With all its crudities and imperfections the idea of the Revolution was that of a conceived body of Right in which all men should share.

But the Revolution, by a strange irony of fate, was destined to bring about a reaction from this very cosmopolitanism of which it was the embodiment. The very attacks made on French soil led quite naturally to an immense outburst of feeling in behalf of France herself—a feeling taken advantage of by Napoleon to build up a great French dominating power which was held to threaten the liberties of mankind. We need not stop to ask whether Napoleon himself really shared the patriotic sentiment of the French people, as his apologists assert he did. It is sufficient for us that he made the French believe that he, of all men, embodied that sentiment. Thus, the Napoleonic wars resulted, in so far as France was concerned, in substituting an intense feeling for "la patrie" for the movement of the "idea" which had stirred the blood of the revolutionists.

In the next place, the very aid offered by France to oppressed nations to recover their liberty, led to a new stirring of national feeling all over Europe. The French soldiers who conquered at Marengo and Rivoli were unconscious agents in advance of the movement for Italian unity and independence. The German admirers of the Revolution were preparing, unknown to themselves, for Sedan and the German Empire. Wherever the French armies went, there were planted on battlefields stained with the blood of the young manhood of Europe the germs of the full-grown plant of nationalism as we have seen it flourishing in the Europe of our day. The force that was to liberate men from old systems of rule, most of which were corrupt and quaint, but comparatively few of which were excessively oppressive, did indeed accomplish its object, but it also did work which had never been dreamed of by those who fought with such almost divine madness to bring old feudal Europe to its appointed end. In politics we always accomplish something quite different from that which we set out to accomplish. The Revolution overthrew the old framework, but, instead of making